



Response to a Final Office Action

Application Ser. No. 10/665,031

This communication is a response to a Final Office Action having a mailing date of 07/16/2004 and setting forth a shortened statutory period for response of three months which would expire on 10/16/2004.

Please do not
Enter.
TTN
9/7/04

Remarks, arguments and amendments

The applicant has studied the applicants comments carefully and has come to the conclusion that the examiner is misreading the reference to Ross when compared to the claims. Applicant is claiming an "inwardly" slanting neck "below" said circular knob. It is clear from the drawings that the neck 4 is slanting "inwardly" and not downwardly as is shown by Ross. Applicant also has amended claim 1 to include that the neck 4 is "slanting inwardly but also that the slant 4 is not only below but also under the circular knob 3. This arrangement is not shown at all by Ross. It could be interpreted that the slant 12 of Ross could be below the knob 17 (if seen from a horizontal plane) but it certainly could not be located under the knob as is now claimed. Again, the slant 12 of Ross is not slanting "inwardly" as previously claimed but only downwardly.

Response to the Examiner's Arguments

The Examiner refuted the applicant's argument that the slant 4 is not slanting inwardly but downwardly. Geometrically, this holding is not correct. When studying the Ross Fig. 5 (cited by the examiner) There is no other way to hold that the slant 12 is slanting downwardly but not inwardly as is shown in applicant's drawings at 4. There is no other way of reading the Ross reference.

In view of all of the above, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection of claims. By amending claim 1, no new matter has been introduced and